UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,334	09/16/2003	Yukio Tajima	117192	9252

25944   7590   07/19/2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
WEINTROP, ADAM S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/662,334	TAJIMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam S. Weintrop	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 June 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kito et al. (US 5,946,464) in view of Cook (US 5,621,892) and further in view of Sweat

et al. (US 7,062,532).

Regarding **claim 1**, Kito et al. discloses a service processing apparatus

comprising: a storing unit (column 3, lines 14-16, where the memory means can store

information pieces) in which are stored (a) instruction data in which are described at

least a location of processing document data and a content of plural service processes

to be executed on the document data (column 5, lines 26-31 and Figures 16,17, and 18,

where the agent definition information contains within it a location of the document to be

processed – such as in Figure 17, Item 1080 with the location being "newly-received

library") and (b) a correspondence relation between instruction data that is to be

processed when a specific event occurs and the specific event (column 5, lines 26-31,

and Figures 16-18, where triggering information is stored with the agent definition

information such as in Figure 16, with the instruction data being to "DeleteMail" as seen

in Item 0100, and the specific event being "Friday at 23:00" as seen in Items 0070 and

0080); an identifying unit that identifies, when notification that the specific event has

occurred is given by at least one of plural service processing apparatuses each

connected to a network instruction data corresponding to the specific event based on

the notification that has occurred on the basis of the correspondence relation (column 2,

lines 43-45, and column 7, lines 23-28, where the trigger monitoring unit is seen as the

identifying unit since it identifies when a specific event has occurred and informs

another unit of the agent definition information associated with the triggering event, and

column 2, lines 30-32, with all servers and clients operating on a network); an

interpreting unit that interprets the instruction data identified by the identifying unit

(column 7, lines 54-67 and column 8, lines 1-4, with the filtering unit seen as the

interpreting unit since it reads the information file and checks its coincidence to start the

action corresponding to the event); and a cooperative processing unit that makes the

plural service processing apparatuses cooperatively execute the plural service

processes on the document data on the basis of the interpretation of the instruction data

of the interpreting unit (column 8, lines 13-16 and lines 34-35, with the action request

processing unit seen as the cooperative processing unit since it received information to

begin the action and instructs action operations as specified by the action information).

Kito et al. does not disclose that the instruction data includes at least one of copying,

printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing. The

general concept of using a service processing apparatus to propose these sorts of

services is well known in the art as illustrated by Cook. Cook describes an event

management system in which events, such as alerts or an expiry of a timer, are mapped

to services providers. The service providers include facsimile devices or printers, among other document and file processes (column 4, line 24-column 5, line 2). Cook's system manages alerts generated by a computer, uses mapping information that describes what service provider is mapped to the alert, and then dispatches the service providers in response to the alert. The system also provides for a memory that stores the request (column 5, lines 58-59), and stores the mapping (column 4, lines 24-27). The event management software in Cook is seen as storing instruction data since it stores the alert request and uses the mapping information to dispatch a service provider. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. with including at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing in the instruction data as taught by Cook in order to add flexibility, since the addition of the variety of hardware creates a variety of different events that must be managed as seen in Cook's disclosure (column 1, lines 59-67). Kito et al. and Cook do not disclose an instruction selection screen for displaying selectable instructions based on user access rights, wherein the user access rights determine available instructions. The general concept of having selectable instructions where user access rights determine what instructions are available is well known in the art as illustrated by Sweat et al. Sweat et al. teaches a document collaboration system where only certain users have instructions accessible to them (column 5, lines 24-28, where a user's options available to them are based on the permission level assigned to the user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. and Cook to include user

permission based selections as taught by Sweat et al. in order to better organize the

document processing system by reducing complexity of the exchange of documents as

noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines 33-37.

Regarding **claims 2, 8, and 14**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the

service processing apparatus of claims 1, 7, and 13, and Kito et al. further discloses the

apparatus comprising: a setting unit that sets the instruction data and content of the

specific event serving as a processing timing of the instruction data (Figure 4, with the

Agent Motion Trigger setting the timing of the specific event and the Agent Operation

setting the instruction data to be performed); and a generating unit that generates, on

the basis of the content of the specific event set by the setting unit, the correspondence

relation and instruction data for executing the plural service processes on the document

data (Figures 16-18, with the agent information file containing instruction data and the

triggering event data, and column 6, lines 26-31, where the agent client makes an agent

definition information file from the settings of the user), and stores the correspondence

relation and the instruction data in the storing unit (column 3, lines 13-16, where each

unit may have memory means for storing information pieces).

Regarding **claims 3, 9, and 15**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the

service processing apparatus of claims 2, 8, and 14, and Kito et al. further discloses the

apparatus comprising an authenticating unit that authenticates a creator of the

instruction data (column 9, lines 64-66, where based on the agent identification

information, the event request occurs, this is equivalent to authenticating a user to

trigger an event since the identification information is checked before every event

execution), wherein the generating unit associates information of the creator of the

instruction data with the instruction data and stores the information of the creator and

the instruction data in the storing unit (column 6, lines 32-45, with the agent

identification information stored with the agent definition information).

Regarding **claim 4**, Kito et al. discloses a service processing method comprising:

identifying, when notification that a specific event has occurred is given by at least one

of plural service processing apparatuses each connected to a network (column 7, lines

41-49, with the trigger monitor unit monitoring for specific events of apparatuses

connected to a network as seen and in column 2, lines 53-60, with the trigger unit being

a part of any groupware function server and column 2, lines 25-32 with the groupware

function servers being connected on a network), instruction data that corresponds to the

specific event based on the notification that has occurred and in which are described at

least a location of processing document data and a content of plural service processes

to be executed on the document data (column 5, lines 26-31 and Figures 16,17, and 18,

where the agent definition information contains within it a location of the document to be

processed – such as in Figure 17, Item 1080 with the location being "newly-received

library" and column 5, lines 26-31, and Figures 16-18, where triggering information is

stored with the agent definition information such as in Figure 16, with the instruction

data being to "DeleteMail" as seen in Item 0100, and the specific event being "Friday at

23:00" as seen in Items 0070 and 0080), on the basis of a correspondence relation

between the specific event and the instruction data that is to be processed when the

specific event occurs (column 2, lines 43-45, and column 7, lines 23-28, where the

trigger monitoring unit identifies when a specific event has occurred and informs another unit of the agent definition information associated with the triggering event); interpreting content of the instruction data identified by the identifying step (column 7, lines 54-67 and column 8, lines 1-4, with the filtering unit seen as able to interpret since it reads the information file and checks its coincidence to start the action corresponding to the event); and making the plural service processing apparatuses cooperatively execute the plural service processes on the document data on the basis of the interpreting step (column 8, lines 13-16 and lines 34-35, with the action request processing unit seen as the being able to make the processes execute since it receives information to begin the action and instructs action operations as specified by the action information). Kito et al. does not disclose that the instruction data includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing. The general concept of using a service processing apparatus to propose these sorts of services is well known in the art as illustrated by Cook. Cook describes an event management system in which events, such as alerts or an expiry of a timer, are mapped to services providers. The service providers include facsimile devices or printers, among other document and file processes (column 4, line 24-column 5, line 2). Cook's system manages alerts generated by a computer, uses mapping information that describes what service provider is mapped to the alert, and then dispatches the service providers in response to the alert. The system also provides for a memory that stores the request (column 5, lines 58-59), and stores the mapping (column 4, lines 24-27). The event management software in Cook is seen as storing instruction data since it stores the alert

request and uses the mapping information to dispatch a service provider. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. with including at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing in the instruction data as taught by Cook in order to add flexibility, since the addition of the variety of hardware creates a variety of different events that must be managed as seen in Cook's disclosure (column 1, lines 59-67). Kito et al. and Cook do not disclose an displaying selectable instructions based on user access rights, wherein the user access rights determine available instructions. The general concept of having selectable instructions where user access rights determine what instructions are available is well known in the art as illustrated by Sweat et al. Sweat et al. teaches a document collaboration system where only certain users have instructions accessible to them (column 5, lines 24-28, where a user's options available to them are based on the permission level assigned to the user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. and Cook to include user permission based selections as taught by Sweat et al. in order to better organize the document processing system by reducing complexity of the exchange of documents as noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines 33-37.

Regarding **claims 5, 11, and 17**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the service processing method of claims 4, 10, and 16, and Kito et al. further discloses the apparatus further comprising: setting the instruction data and content of the specific event serving as a processing timing of the instruction data (Figure 4, with the Agent

Motion Trigger setting the timing of the specific event and the Agent Operation setting

the instruction data to be performed); and generating, on the basis of the content of the

specific event set by the setting step, the correspondence relation and instruction data

for executing the plural service processes on the document data, and storing the

correspondence relation and the instruction data in a storing unit (Figures 16-18, with

the agent information file containing instruction data and the triggering event data, and

column 6, lines 26-31, where the agent client makes an agent definition information file

from the settings of the user and column 3, lines 13-16, where each unit may have

memory means for storing information pieces).

Regarding **claims 6, 12, and 18**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the

service processing method of claims 5, 11, and 17, and Kito et al. discloses the

apparatus further comprising authenticating a creator of the instruction data (column 9,

lines 64-66, where based on the agent identification information, the event request

occurs, this is equivalent to authenticating a user to trigger an event since the

identification information is checked before every event execution), wherein information

of the creator of the instruction data is associated with the instruction data, and the

information of the creator and the instruction data are stored in the storing unit in the

generating step (column 6, lines 32-45, with the agent identification information stored

with the agent definition information).

Regarding **claim 7**, Kito et al. discloses a service processing apparatus

comprising: a storing unit (column 3, lines 14-16, where the memory means can store

information pieces) in which are stored (a) instruction data in which are described at

least a location of processing document data and a content of plural service processes

to be executed on the document data (column 5, lines 26-31 and Figures 16,17, and 18,

where the agent definition information contains within it a location of the document to be

processed – such as in Figure 17, Item 1080 with the location being "newly-received

library") and (b) a correspondence relation between the instruction data that is to be

processed when a specific event occurs and the specific event (column 5, lines 26-31,

and Figures 16-18, where triggering information is stored with the agent definition

information such as in Figure 16, with the instruction data being to "DeleteMail" as seen

in Item 0100, and the specific event being "Friday at 23:00" as seen in Items 0070 and

0080); an identifying unit that identifies, when notification that the specific event has

occurred is given by at least one of plural service processing apparatuses each

connected to a network, the instruction data corresponding to the specific event based

on notification that has occurred on the basis of the correspondence relation (column 2,

lines 43-45, and column 7, lines 23-28, where the trigger monitoring unit is seen as the

identifying unit since it identifies when a specific event has occurred and informs

another unit of the agent definition information associated with the triggering event, and

column 2, lines 30-32, with all servers and clients operating on a network); and a

sending unit that sends the instruction data identified by the identifying unit to a

cooperative processing apparatus that cooperatively executes the plural service

processes on the document data (column 7, lines 66-67, column 8, lines 1-4, where the

result of the filtering is sent to the action request processing unit, and this is seen as

equivalent to sending the instruction data to a processing apparatus, and column 8,

lines 34-35, where the action operations are executed in response to the action

information). Kito et al. does not disclose that the instruction data includes at least one

of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image

processing. The general concept of using a service processing apparatus to propose

these sorts of services is well known in the art as illustrated by Cook. Cook describes

an event management system in which events, such as alerts or an expiry of a timer,

are mapped to services providers. The service providers include facsimile devices or

printers, among other document and file processes (column 4, line 24-column 5, line 2).

Cook's system manages alerts generated by a computer, uses mapping information that

describes what service provider is mapped to the alert, and then dispatches the service

providers in response to the alert. The system also provides for a memory that stores

the request (column 5, lines 58-59), and stores the mapping (column 4, lines 24-27).

The event management software in Cook is seen as storing instruction data since it

stores the alert request and uses the mapping information to dispatch a service

provider. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify Kito et al. with including at least one of copying, printing, scanning,

sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing in the instruction data as

taught by Cook in order to add flexibility, since the addition of the variety of hardware

creates a variety of different events that must be managed as seen in Cook's disclosure

(column 1, lines 59-67). Kito et al. and Cook do not disclose an instruction selection

screen for displaying selectable instructions based on user access rights, wherein the

user access rights determine available instructions. The general concept of having

selectable instructions where user access rights determine what instructions are

available is well known in the art as illustrated by Sweat et al. Sweat et al. teaches a

document collaboration system where only certain users have instructions accessible to

them (column 5, lines 24-28, where a user's options available to them are based on the

permission level assigned to the user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. and Cook to include user

permission based selections as taught by Sweat et al. in order to better organize the

document processing system by reducing complexity of the exchange of documents as

noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines 33-37.

Regarding **claim 10**, Kito et al. discloses a service processing method

comprising: identifying, when notification that a specific event has occurred is given by

at least one of plural service processing apparatuses each connected to a network

(column 7, lines 41-49, with the trigger monitor unit monitoring for specific events of

apparatuses connected to a network as seen and in column 2, lines 53-60, with the

trigger unit being a part of any groupware function server and column 2, lines 25-32 with

the groupware function servers being connected on a network), instruction data that

corresponds to the specific event based on the notification that has occurred and in

which are described at least a location of processing document data and a content of

plural service processes to be executed on the document data (column 5, lines 26-31

and Figures 16,17, and 18, where the agent definition information contains within it a

location of the document to be processed – such as in Figure 17, Item 1080 with the

location being "newly-received library" and column 5, lines 26-31, and Figures 16-18,

where triggering information is stored with the agent definition information such as in

Figure 16, with the instruction data being to "DeleteMail" as seen in Item 0100, and the

specific event being "Friday at 23:00" as seen in Items 0070 and 0080), on the basis of

a correspondence relation between the specific event and the instruction data that is to

be processed when the specific event occurs (column 2, lines 43-45, and column 7,

lines 23-28, where the trigger monitoring unit identifies when a specific event has

occurred and informs another unit of the agent definition information associated with the

triggering event); sending the identified instruction data to a cooperative processing

apparatus that cooperatively executes the plural service processes on the document

data (column 7, lines 66-67, column 8, lines 1-4, where the result of the filtering is sent

to the action request processing unit, and this is seen as equivalent to sending the

instruction data to a processing apparatus, and column 8, lines 34-35, where the action

operations are executed in response to the action information). Kito et al. does not

disclose that the instruction data includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning,

sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing. The general concept of

using a service processing apparatus to propose these sorts of services is well known in

the art as illustrated by Cook. Cook describes an event management system in which

events, such as alerts or an expiry of a timer, are mapped to services providers. The

service providers include facsimile devices or printers, among other document and file

processes (column 4, line 24-column 5, line 2). Cook's system manages alerts

generated by a computer, uses mapping information that describes what service

provider is mapped to the alert, and then dispatches the service providers in response

to the alert. The system also provides for a memory that stores the request (column 5, lines 58-59), and stores the mapping (column 4, lines 24-27). The event management software in Cook is seen as storing instruction data since it stores the alert request and uses the mapping information to dispatch a service provider. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. with including at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing in the instruction data as taught by Cook in order to add flexibility, since the addition of the variety of hardware creates a variety of different events that must be managed as seen in Cook's disclosure (column 1, lines 59-67). Kito et al. and Cook do not disclose displaying selectable instructions based on user access rights, wherein the user access rights determine available instructions. The general concept of having selectable instructions where user access rights determine what instructions are available is well known in the art as illustrated by Sweat et al. Sweat et al. teaches a document collaboration system where only certain users have instructions accessible to them (column 5, lines 24-28, where a user's options available to them are based on the permission level assigned to the user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. and Cook to include user permission based selections as taught by Sweat et al. in order to better organize the document processing system by reducing complexity of the exchange of documents as noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines 33-37.

Regarding **claim 13**, Kito et al. discloses a service processing apparatus comprising: a storing unit (column 3, lines 14-16, where the memory means can store

information pieces) in which are stored (a) instruction data in which are described at

least a location of processing document data and a content of plural service processes

to be executed on the document data (column 5, lines 26-31 and Figures 16,17, and 18,

where the agent definition information contains within it a location of the document to be

processed – such as in Figure 17, Item 1080 with the location being "newly-received

library") and (b) a correspondence relation between the instruction data that is to be

processed when a specific event occurs and the specific event (column 5, lines 26-31,

and Figures 16-18, where triggering information is stored with the agent definition

information such as in Figure 16, with the instruction data being to "DeleteMail" as seen

in Item 0100, and the specific event being "Friday at 23:00" as seen in Items 0070 and

0080); an identifying unit that identifies, when notification that the specific event has

occurred is given by at least one of plural service processing apparatuses each

connected to a network, the instruction data corresponding to the specific event based

on the notification that has occurred on the basis of the correspondence relation

(column 2, lines 43-45, and column 7, lines 23-28, where the trigger monitoring unit is

seen as the identifying unit since it identifies when a specific event has occurred and

informs another unit of the agent definition information associated with the triggering

event, and column 2, lines 30-32, with all servers and clients operating on a network);

and a sending unit that sends the instruction data identified by the identifying unit to

another service processing apparatus that conducts a service process on the

document data described in the instruction data (column 8, lines 24-35, where the result

of the filtering is sent to the action request processing unit and then that activates other

processing units, such as the mail processing unit to a process a service on the data

from the action information). Kito et al. does not disclose that the instruction data

includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving

facsimiles and image processing. The general concept of using a service processing

apparatus to propose these sorts of services is well known in the art as illustrated by

Cook. Cook describes an event management system in which events, such as alerts or

an expiry of a timer, are mapped to services providers. The service providers include

facsimile devices or printers, among other document and file processes (column 4, line

24-column 5, line 2). Cook's system manages alerts generated by a computer, uses

mapping information that describes what service provider is mapped to the alert, and

then dispatches the service providers in response to the alert. The system also

provides for a memory that stores the request (column 5, lines 58-59), and stores the

mapping (column 4, lines 24-27). The event management software in Cook is seen as

storing instruction data since it stores the alert request and uses the mapping

information to dispatch a service provider. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. with including at least

one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image

processing in the instruction data as taught by Cook in order to add flexibility, since the

addition of the variety of hardware creates a variety of different events that must be

managed as seen in Cook's disclosure (column 1, lines 59-67). Kito et al. and Cook do

not disclose an instruction selection screen for displaying selectable instructions based

on user access rights, wherein the user access rights determine available instructions.

The general concept of having selectable instructions where user access rights

determine what instructions are available is well known in the art as illustrated by Sweat

et al. Sweat et al. teaches a document collaboration system where only certain users

have instructions accessible to them (column 5, lines 24-28, where a user's options

available to them are based on the permission level assigned to the user). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify

Kito et al. and Cook to include user permission based selections as taught by Sweat et

al. in order to better organize the document processing system by reducing complexity

of the exchange of documents as noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines

33-37.

Regarding **claim 16**, Kito et al. discloses a service processing method

comprising: identifying, when notification that a specific event has occurred is given by

at least one of plural service processing apparatuses each connected to a network

(column 7, lines 41-49, with the trigger monitor unit monitoring for specific events of

apparatuses connected to a network as seen and in column 2, lines 53-60, with the

trigger unit being a part of any groupware function server and column 2, lines 25-32 with

the groupware function servers being connected on a network), instruction data that

corresponds to the specific event based on the notification that has occurred and in

which are described at least a location of processing document data and a content of

plural service processes to be executed on the document data (column 5, lines 26-31

and Figures 16,17, and 18, where the agent definition information contains within it a

location of the document to be processed – such as in Figure 17, Item 1080 with the

location being "newly-received library" and column 5, lines 26-31, and Figures 16-18,

where triggering information is stored with the agent definition information such as in

Figure 16, with the instruction data being to "DeleteMail" as seen in Item 0100, and the

specific event being "Friday at 23:00" as seen in Items 0070 and 0080), on the basis of

a correspondence relation between the specific event and the instruction data that is to

be processed when the specific event occurs (column 2, lines 43-45, and column 7,

lines 23-28, where the trigger monitoring unit identifies when a specific event has

occurred and informs another unit of the agent definition information associated with the

triggering event); and sending the instruction data identified by the identifying step to

another service processing apparatus that conducts a service process on the document

data described in the instruction data (column 8, lines 24-35, where the result of the

filtering is sent to the action request processing unit and then that activates other

processing units, such as the mail processing unit to a process a service on the data

from the action information). Kito et al. does not disclose that the instruction data

includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving

facsimiles and image processing. The general concept of using a service processing

apparatus to propose these sorts of services is well known in the art as illustrated by

Cook. Cook describes an event management system in which events, such as alerts or

an expiry of a timer, are mapped to services providers. The service providers include

facsimile devices or printers, among other document and file processes (column 4, line

24-column 5, line 2). Cook's system manages alerts generated by a computer, uses

mapping information that describes what service provider is mapped to the alert, and

then dispatches the service providers in response to the alert. The system also

provides for a memory that stores the request (column 5, lines 58-59), and stores the

mapping (column 4, lines 24-27). The event management software in Cook is seen as

storing instruction data since it stores the alert request and uses the mapping

information to dispatch a service provider. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. with including at least

one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image

processing in the instruction data as taught by Cook in order to add flexibility, since the

addition of the variety of hardware creates a variety of different events that must be

managed as seen in Cook's disclosure (column 1, lines 59-67). Kito et al. and Cook do

not disclose displaying selectable instructions based on user access rights, wherein the

user access rights determine available instructions. The general concept of having

selectable instructions where user access rights determine what instructions are

available is well known in the art as illustrated by Sweat et al. Sweat et al. teaches a

document collaboration system where only certain users have instructions accessible to

them (column 5, lines 24-28, where a user's options available to them are based on the

permission level assigned to the user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al. and Cook to include user

permission based selections as taught by Sweat et al. in order to better organize the

document processing system by reducing complexity of the exchange of documents as

noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines 33-37.

Regarding **claim 19**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the service processing apparatus of claim 1, and Kito et al. further discloses the apparatus wherein the specific event is reception of document data from outside (column 10, lines 11-26, where the event can be a new document added to a new library binder and this is seen as equivalent to new data reception from the outside).

Regarding **claim 20**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the service processing apparatus of claim 1, and Kito et al. further discloses the apparatus wherein the specific event is arrival of a predetermined time (column 9, lines 49-55, where the trigger information is set as a specific time such as 23:00).

Regarding **claim 21**, Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. teach the service processing apparatus of claim 1, and Sweat et al. further teaches wherein the available instructions include instructions available to all users when a user is not authenticated (column 14, lines 65-67, where if a user is not authenticated into the document collaboration system, that user receives no privileges, in other words, if a user is not authenticated, the instructions available to the user are the same as what's available to all the other non-authenticated users, which is the absence of available instructions).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kito et al., Cook, and Sweat et al. to include the further teachings of Sweat et al. of what instructions to give non-authenticated users in order to better organize the document processing system by reducing complexity of the exchange of documents as noted in Sweat et al.'s disclosure in column 1, lines 33-37.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam S. Weintrop whose telephone number is 571-270-1604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/AW/

7/11/07

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER